

**GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**  
**A B S T R A C T**

Public Servants - Agricultural Marketing Department - Departmental Proceedings initiated against Sri L. Surender, Ex-Executive Engineer(M), Kadapa and Executive Engineer(M)(Retired), Guntur for allegation of irregularities in possession of assets disproportionate to the known sources - Further action dropped - Orders - Issued.

=====

**AGRICULTURE & COOPERATION (VIG.II) DEPARTMENT**

G.O.Rt.No.  
2009

Dated: 03-08-

Read the following

:-

1. From the D.G., ACB, Hyd. Lr.No.22/RC-CR/93, dt.3-2-1996.
2. GORt.No.432, Agri. & Coop.(Mktg.)Dept., dt.21-04-1997.
3. Govt.Memo No. 7815/Mktg.II(1)/94-26, dt.5-2-1999.
4. Govt.Memo No. 34/Vig.II(1)/2001-11, dt.30-03-2005.
5. From Addl.DOM & Inquiry Officer, O/o C&DOAM, Hyderabad  
Inquiry Report dt.26-06-2007.

--oOo--

**ORDER:**

In the reference 1<sup>st</sup> read above, the Director General, Anti Corruption Bureau, Hyderabad had reported that Sri L. Surender, Executive Engineer acquired the assets either in his name or in the name of his dependent family members or benami worth Rs.8,30,498/-whereas his income is Rs.5,75,000/ and recommended to take departmental action for awarding major penalty against the Accused Officer. In the reference 2<sup>nd</sup> read above, Government initiated departmental proceedings by framing charges against the aforesaid Accused Officer.

2. The Charged Officer has submitted his written statement of defence denying the charges framed against him. As the Charged Officer has denied the charges, Government appointed the Additional Director of Marketing, O/o Commissioner & Director of Agricultural Marketing, Hyderabad as Inquiry Officer to conduct regular inquiry into the charges framed against the Charged Officer vide reference 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> read above.

3. After conducting a regular inquiry, the Additional Director of Marketing, O/o Commissioner & Director of Agricultural Marketing, Hyderabad has submitted his Inquiry Report concluding that the case of disproportionate source of income against the Charged Officer cannot be proved during the departmental inquiry.

3. Government, after careful examination of the matter, have observed that the Inquiry Officer in his report held that case of disproportionate source of income against the Charged Officer cannot be proved during the departmental inquiry and Anti Corruption Bureau itself had not made out a case of disproportionate income as admitted in the Court of Principal Special Judge and there is no evidence to prove that the Charged Officer indulged in malpractice in allotting contracts to kith and kin and favoured his relations. As such, Government have decided to accept the Inquiry Report and drop the charges framed against the Charged Officer Sri L. Surender, Executive Engineer(M) (now retired).

4. Accordingly, Government hereby drop further action against Sri L. Surender, Ex-Executive Engineer(M), Kadapa and Executive Engineer(M)(Retired), Guntur, as the charges are held not proved in a regular inquiry.

5. The Commissioner and Director of Agricultural Marketing, Hyderabad shall take necessary action in the matter, accordingly.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

**K. R. KISHORE**  
**PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT**

To  
Sri L. Surender, Ex-Executive Engineer(M), Kadapa and  
Executive Engineer(M)(Retired), Guntur  
(Through: The Commissioner & Director of Agricultural Marketing, A.P.,  
Hyderabad)

Copy to: -

The Commissioner & Director of Agricultural Marketing, A.P., Hyderabad.

The Director General, ACB, Hyderabad.

The Secretary, A.P.V.C., Hyderabad(No.564/VC.I(2)/95-17, dt.11-06-2009)

Sc/Sf.

// FORWARDED :: BY ORDER //

SECTION OFFICER

Source : A.P.V.C. Manual Vol.II

**G.O.Ms.No.2 Genl.Admn.(Ser.C) Dept., dated 4-1-1999 regarding penalty of dismissal in cases of bribery**

**Subject Heading: Dismissal — in cases of corruption, bribery**

\*\*\*\*\*

Read the following:

1. G.A.(Ser.C) Dept., Cir.Memo.No.3037/Ser.C/64-3, dt.26-11-64.
2. G.A.(Ser.C) Dept., Govt.Memo.No.1718/Ser.C/75-1, dt.22-11-75.
3. G.A.(Ser.C) Dept., Cir.Memo.No.3824/Ser.C/98-2, dt.9-2-98.

**ORDER:**

In the Memo. first read above, instructions were issued, among others, that in proved cases of bribery and corruption, no punishment other than that of dismissal be considered adequate and if any lesser punishment is to be awarded in such cases adequate reasons should be given for it in writing. In the Memo second read above, instructions were issued to the effect that the officers convicted in Criminal Cases should normally be dismissed from service. The above instructions have been reiterated for strict compliance vide the reference third read above.

2. It is the earnest endeavour of the Government to ensure a clean and transparent administration. To have this policy transcended to the grass root

level it is keenly felt that the officers with doubtful integrity and involved in criminal offences shall be weeded out in order to ensure efficient functioning. To ensure clean and efficient administration, the Government direct that in all proved cases of misappropriation, bribery, bigamy, corruption, moral turpitude, forgery and outraging the modesty of women, the penalty of dismissal from service shall be imposed.